



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,055	02/17/2004	Yaniv Feinberg	60001.0308US01/MS305250.1	9688

27488 7590 05/28/2008
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

QUELER, ADAM M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/780,055

Applicant(s)

FEINBERG ET AL.

Examiner

ADAM M. QUELER

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12, 14-19 and 22-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12, 14-19 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 2/6/2008 and Remarks filed 1/7/2008
2. Claims 1-10, 12, 14-19, and 22-24 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 22 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
5. **Claims 1-10,12,14-19 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Unicode Standard Annex #9, The Bidirectional Algorithm” by Mark Davis.**

Regarding independent claim(s) 1, Davis teaches receiving a text selection containing text portions entered according to a plurality of spoken languages (English and Arabic, §2.1, para. 1).

Art Unit: 2178

Davis teaches determining whether a text reading order for rendering the text selection on a computer-enabled display has been set (explicit, §2.1). As the claim(s) covers the alternative embodiments of having a text reading order set and a text reading order not being set, since Davis finds a set reading order, limitations involving what happens if the reading order is not set are not evaluated and are thus anticipated by Davis finding the set reading order. Davis teaches rendering the first portion of the text selection in the determined text reading order for rendering text according to the first spoken language (§3, bullet 2-3).

Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine render the text based on the set alignment so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 2, all data in a computer is inherently stored at a memory location.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 3, Davis teaches returning the text reading order for rendering the text selection on a computer-enabled display (§ 3 rendering based on the settings, which include the order, §2.1).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 4, as per claim 3 Davis teaches the text is rendered correctly. Inherently, the order must have been returned.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 5, Davis teaches a LTR reading order (§2.1).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 6, Davis teaches a RTL reading order (§2.1).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 7-10, as the claim(s) covers the alternative possibilities of having a text reading order set and a text reading order not being set, since Davis finds a set

reading order, limitations involving what happens if the reading order is not set are not evaluated and are thus anticipated by Davis finding the set reading order.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 12, Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the proper alignment and returning it to the renderer, so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 14, Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine render the text based on the set alignment so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Regarding independent claim(s) 22, Davis teaches receiving a text selection containing text portions entered according to a plurality of spoken languages (English and Arabic, §2.1, para. 1). Davis teaches determining whether a text reading order for rendering the text selection on a computer-enabled display has been set (explicit, §2.1). As the claim(s) covers the alternative possibilities of having a text reading order set and a text reading order not being set, since Davis finds a set reading order, limitations involving what happens if the reading order is not set are not evaluated and are thus anticipated by Davis finding the set reading order. Davis teaches rendering the first portion of the text selection in the determined text reading order for rendering text according to the first spoken language (§3, bullet 2-3).

Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine render the text based on the set alignment so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 15, 23, Davis teaches rendering the text in the correct order.

Davis teaches a second portion in a second language and rendering them according to the correct order (§2.1). Inherently, this includes determining the correct order.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 16, Davis teaches rendering the text in the correct order. Davis teaches a second portion in a second language and rendering them according to the correct order (§2.1)

Regarding dependent claim(s) 17, Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine render the text based on the set alignment so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 18, 19, Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine render the text based on the set alignment so it is displayed the way the author intended, including left and right alignment.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 24, Davis teaches rendering the text in the correct order. Davis teaches a second portion in a second language and rendering them according to the correct order

(§2.1). Davis does not teach alignment. Official Notice is taken that many text application set manual overrides for text alignment (left justified, right justified, centered). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine render the text based on the set alignment so it is displayed the way the author intended.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 1/07/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's remarks under Heading III:

Applicant alleges that added limitations of “scanning...” overcome Davis. However, as explained in the interview, the claims cover a number of conditionals which encompass the embodiments in the claim of where the condition occurs and where it does not occur. This reading of claims is consistent with the claims a whole because if it were not several of the dependent claim would be improper as they would broaden their parents. In this case, the added limitations are not part of the alternative that Davis is recited as teaching. The alternative that is described in the rejections above is sufficient for teaching or suggesting the claim. However, it does appear that such limitation as described in the other embodiment are found in Davis see for example §3.2.

Regarding Applicant's remarks under Heading IV:

Applicant traverses the Official Notice in the rejection. As per MPEP 2144.03 C. and D, “Claris Works – Word Processing” (p. 4) and “CSS3 Text Module W3C Candidate Recommendation 14 May 2003” (§4.1) are both added as directly corresponding evidence to

support the prior common knowledge finding the setting the text alignment was well-known at the time of the invention.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ADAM M. QUELER whose telephone number is (571)272-4140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2178

aq